Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 11, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 9, and 18 have been amended and claims 14 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to clarify that the trigger is assigned to the hub on a per-trunk basis so that the hub suspends all calls from a trunk group to the hub prior to launching the query to the service control point, the trunk group including the resold line. The claims have further been amended to clarify the hub is operative to utilize tabular information in the service control point to make routing decisions based on an area in which a caller making the call from the resold line is located. Support for these amendments may be found on page 9, lines 8-26 and on page 11, lines 2-7 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Culli et al. (US 6,205,214, hereinafter "Culli") in view of Moss et al. (US 5,917,899, hereinafter "Moss") and further in view of Kelly et al. (US 6,341,162, hereinafter "Kelly").

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Culli, Moss, and Kelly. Claims 14 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a system for routing a call made from a calling line resold to a carrier. The system includes a switch coupled to the resold line, the switch being operative to determine at the switch whether the call is from the resold

line and to route the call to a hub without any query to a service control point based on determining the call is from the resold line; the hub having a trigger provisioned thereon to cause the hub to launch a query to the service control point upon receiving the call from the switch, wherein the trigger is assigned to the hub on a per-trunk basis so that the hub suspends all calls from a trunk group to the hub prior to launching the query to the service control point, the trunk group including the resold line; and the service control point operative to receive the query from the hub and to provide routing instructions to the hub based upon resold line routing information stored in the service control point, the routing information identifying a location specified by the carrier for handling the call, wherein the routing information comprises a single set of line class codes assigned to all resold lines, wherein the line class codes reference a trunk group to the hub, wherein the hub is operative to utilize tabular information in the service control point to make routing decisions based on an area in which a caller making the call from the resold line is located.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Culli, Moss, and Kelly fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose that the trigger is assigned to the hub on a per-trunk basis so that the hub suspends all calls from a trunk group to the hub prior to launching the query to the service control point, the trunk group including the resold line, or that the hub is operative to utilize tabular information in the service control point to make routing decisions based on an area in which a caller making the call from the resold line is located.

Culli discusses a local routing system for selectively routing traffic in a telecommunications network according to a local service provider's preferences. (See Culli column 2, lines 22-26.) Culli discusses that calling scopes and routing within centrexes are usually controlled by line class codes and/or common block translations that are unique to the centrex customer. (See Culli column 7, lines 37-39.) Culli also discusses fields within a LRS routing table: the signaling point code (SPC) for each switch which the LSP purchases LRR or LRU, the office route to which the LSP wants all local operator calls sent, the office route to which the LSP wants all local directory assistance calls sent, the office route to which the LSP wants all local traffic calls sent (LRU only), and in the case of the AXE-10 switch the office route to which the LSP wants all 0- calls sent. (See Culli column 9 line 60 through column 10 line 29.) Culli also discusses that the LRS utilizes both originating and terminating triggers on an SSP and that the LRS requires the triggers to be applied on a per telephone number basis. (See Culli column 20, lines 18-20).

As conceded in the Office Action, Culli fails to teach determining whether a call is from a resold line without querying an SCP or that the routing information comprises a single set of line class codes assigned to all resold lines. It is respectfully submitted that Culli also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest that the trigger is assigned to the hub on a per-trunk basis so that the hub suspends all calls from a trunk group to the hub prior to launching the query to the service control point. As discussed above, Culli discusses an LRS that requires the triggers to be applied on a per telephone number (i.e., a single line) basis and not a per-trunk basis. Thus Culli does not disclose a hub which suspends all calls from a trunk group to the hub prior to launching the query to the service control

point. Furthermore, Culli also fails to disclose a hub which utilizes tabular information in the service control point to make routing decisions based on an area in which a caller making the call from the resold line is located. As discussed above, Culli merely discusses utilizing an LRS routing table to determine an office route for sending various types of calls. The LRS routing table discussed in Culli (see Table 1 in col. 10, lines 5-13) however, fails to disclose the area in which a caller making the call from the resold line is located.

Moss, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Culli, discusses an advanced intelligent network to connect a plurality of virtual networks using the following steps: (a) Receiving a number of digits at a first service switching point in a first local access and transport area; (b) Sending a query to a switching control point; (c) When the digits result in a call that is an interLATA call, sending a response to the first service switching point that contains a routing instruction to a first hub service switching point; (d) Routing the call to the first hub service switching point; (e) Transmitting an initial address message to the first hub service switching point; (f) Sending a second query to the switching control point from the first hub service switching point; (g) Receiving a second response from the switching control point and (h) Routing the call over a tie line to a second hub service switching point in a second local access and transport area. (See Moss column 1, lines 52-67.)

Moss however, fails to disclose a per trunk trigger which suspends all calls from a trunk group to the hub prior to launching a query to the service control point, as specified in amended claim 1. In contrast, Moss is similar to Culli in that the reference only discusses per line triggering (see column 2, line 30 through column 3, line 18 and column

4, lines 22-29). Moss also fails to disclose a hub which utilizes tabular information in the service control point to make routing decisions based on an area in which a caller making the call from the resold line is located, as specified in amended claim 1. Moss merely discusses the routing of calls between service switching points in local access and transport areas based on an original called party ID (see column 4, lines 22-44) and not the area in which a caller making a call from a resold line is located.

Kelly, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Culli and Moss, discusses a method of operating a telecommunications intelligent network in which detection point processing for a call switched by a service switching point (SSP) is carried out at a service control point (SCP) remote from the SSP. (See Kelly column 1, lines 33-36.) Kelly however, like Culli and Moss fails to disclose a per trunk trigger which suspends all calls from a trunk group to the hub prior to launching a query to the service control point, as specified in amended claim 1 (instead, Kelly only discusses triggering in connection with detection point processing (i.e., the times at which control is passed from an SSP to an SCP)) – See column 1, lines 54-66.

Based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Culli, Moss, and Kelly and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-8 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 9 and 18 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 10-13, 15-17, and 19 depend from amended claims 9 and 18 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: October 31, 2007

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299